DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 306 825 HE 022 487

AUTHOR Caldwell, Roger L.
TITLE Strategic Planning and the Arizona Universities.
INSTITUTION Arizona Board of Regents, Phoenix.
PUB DATE Nov 88
NOTE 37p.; In "The Arizona Board of Regents' Task Force on Excellence, Efficiency and Competitiveness. Final Report and Working Papers." Volume Two. For Volumes One and Two, see HE 022 446-447. For individual working papers, see HE 022 448-480 and HE 022 482-501.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Change Strategies; Competition; *Educational Change; Educational Planning; Educational Quality; Efficiency; Excellence in Education; Higher Education; Long Range Planning; Public Colleges; *State Universities; *Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS *Arizona; Arizona State University; Arizona Task Force on Excellence Efficiency Compet; Northern Arizona University; *Strategic Planning; University of Arizona

ABSTRACT

One of the working papers in the final report of the Arizona Board of Regents' Task Force on Excellence, Efficiency and Competitiveness, this document focuses on the normal and documented activities that could be described as leading to strategic choices and implementation efforts in the Arizona universities. The strategic planning literature is discussed in an effort to compare the Arizona process to that of other universities. A brief review of the changing activities of the universities is listed to place the need for change in perspective. The Arizona universities have changed significantly in the relatively recent past, and the timing for such a planned process is excellent, with the maturing of the universities and the anticipated changes in the external environment occurring at about the same time. Two sections focus on the following: (1) strategic planning issues; Arizona universities' planning activities; relevant planning reports; current planning process; current status of planning documents; strategic plan and action plan; special concerns to address by a strategic plan; planning pitfalls; and approaches to coordinated planning; and (2) background: universities in transition; sharing an academic strategy; description of selected planning processes for other universities; content of a typical strategic planning process; specific content guidelines; mission statement guidelines; description of Arizona Board of Regents universities planning process 1977-1988; and the future needs of the state committees. Contains 18 references. (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED306825

STRATEGIC PLANNING AND THE ARIZONA UNIVERSITIES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ROGER L. CALDWELL

PART I.

DESCRIPTION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

PURPOSE

This paper will focus on the formal and documented activities that could be described as leading to strategic choices and implementation efforts in the Arizona universities. It will also discuss the strategic planning literature in an effort to compare the Arizona process to that of other universities. A brief review of the changing activities of the universities is listed to place the need for change in perspective. Any references to specific university planning activities are used as examples of current operations as the strategic planning process is actively underway.[1]

DEFINITIONS

The term "strategic planning" has come to mean different things to different people. It is an important concept and is worth providing a range of definitions to better understand the most appropriate interpretation of the term by the Arizona universities. This report will include several such definitions, but basically the strategic planning concept concentrates on changes in the external environment, identifies university strengths and weaknesses, and then catalogs the few areas where selected programs are required or focused excellence can be attained. It is especially helpful when the environment is changing and uncertain and when anticipated resources are constrained; these conditions currently exist.

The Arizona universities have begun a process, but there are substantial differences in the methods among the universities and between the universities and the Board of Regents' staff. The overall planning process has lacked clarity for several years. While it is obvious that all Arizona universities have a "plan" for moving in a certain direction, the actual plans vary widely in approach, content, and degree to which the results are communicated to others.

There are several approaches one could take to effect a strategic planning process; the most appropriate choice depends on factors such as the internal operations of the universities and the ABOR staff, the external environment (e.g., local, state, national, international), the visions and current projects of the universities and the ABOR, and the purpose of the plan. The strategic

Roger L. Caldwell has been a member of the University of Arizona for 20 years, where he is a Professor of Soil and Water Science. He has served in several administrative positions relating to general environment, energy conservation, computing and information services, and academic planning. He has taught in the fields of plant diseases and pesticides, environment, alternative futures, and scientific communication methods. He has served on several state and local governmental committees relating to economic development, transportation and environmental concerns.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AZ Board of Regents

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE 022 487

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

planning process can also serve to make universities distinguished. Newman (1987) has listed a series of items that "make a university great"; the essentials of strategic planning (or just "good management") occur numerous times in such a listing.

CHANGING TIMES

The Arizona universities have changed significantly in the relatively recent past.[2] The changes taking place in society (especially the demographic, economic, and technological trends) will create uncertainty for a long period (perhaps a decade), requiring that target directions be understood and chosen to maintain efficient and effective university programs.[3] Strategic planning is the vehicle to address these changes and opportunities.

The timing for such a planning process is excellent, with the maturing of the Arizona universities and the anticipated changes in the external environment occurring about the same time. The demographic trends are causing a national decrease in the traditional college-age population for the next six or so years. The economic trends are mixed but suggest past trends will not be continued as the national debt is reduced and the major shifts occur among the various sectors of the economy. It is also timely due to current interest by the universities and the Board of Regents (this is representative of a growing interest in this type of planning in the higher education community).

The three Arizona universities are somewhat atypical of the average public university in the United States even though we are in a state with average population (ranked 25 nationally). For example, the number of universities for our population level is relatively small and are essentially all publicly funded,[4] the rate of growth of all three universities has been quite rapid. However, the growth rates have not been the same for all universities (Table 1). For example, during the 15 year period 1970 to 1985, ASU and NAU grew about three times as fast as the UA in both student credit hours taken and headcount enrollment, but headcount enrollment grew significantly more rapidly than the credits taken, indicating the part time nature of a major part of the increases. This is an important issue, as allocation of resources directed at growth has a different effect than those directed at program development. The three Arizona universities are also different from one another in historic activities, program structure and focus, rate of growth and development (and related types of resource demands), and disciplines of major focus.

Table 1. Growth Rates of Arizona Universities 1970-1985

University	Unit	15-Year Growth	Average Annual Growth
ASU	SCH	34.0%	2.3%
	HC	53.5%	3.6%
NAU	SCH	30.4%	2.0%
	HC	54.6%	3.6%
UA	SCH	11.6%	0.8%
	HC	17.6%	1.2%

SCH = Student Credit Hours; HC = headcount enrollment

Changes in the non-university environment will have large effects on the universities[5]. The major driving forces in the external environment include:

- The increasingly international scope of our economic, political, and social processes and the role of the universities in economic development and competitiveness of the state will impact on the curriculum and the external relations of the universities.

- Changing mix of types of students and their reasons for attaining higher

education (and the techniques of receiving that education); this will involve changes in initial access opportunities as well as after enrollment retention efforts and continuing education opportunities.

- Uncertain economic future related to national and international debt, increased internationalization of the economy, and shifts from traditional industries to small business orientation.

- Shifts in political attitudes and social values, increased need for greater affirmative action towards the minorities represented in Arizona, in both the workplace and the educational system.

- Increased interest in assessment of the products of the educational systems and the competive nature of new "knowledge industries" against the traditional university.

- Increasing gap between types of available jobs and types of college training, between college demanding jobs and low ability jobs, and job opportunities for young and old alike. Technological changes and their impacts brought about by the information industries, materials sciences, and biological revolution will be difficult to predict but substantial.

- Job growth requiring higher education is expected in fields requiring training in business, engineering, health sciences, or education, but substantial job growth will also occur in low skills areas as well.

To successfully navigate the future, we will to increase our use of several skills, including:

- Understanding the need and developing additional means to operate under conditions of uncertainty and flexibility,

- Improving our ability to anticipate the unanticipated and to be prepared for sudden changes in the familiar,

- Developing our capability to understand multiple effects of seemingly simple decisions or events and consideration of the positive and negative effects of change on the institution and society, and

- Finding and accessing relevant information from among the vast amount of data.

These techniques could be incorporated under the process of strategic planning that realistically addresses the changes taking place in the external environment.

STRATEGIC PLANNING ISSUES

RATIONALE

Strategic planning concentrates on external trends and identifies the several areas where the particular strengths of an institution most closely match future demands. By necessity, this approach precludes being "all things to all people;" it therefore requires substantial and realistic analysis of external and internal conditions and communication to all concerned parties. It could appropriately be described as the process that will lead to "focused excellence" within the individual universities, but it must also provide for those activities that need to be "quality" (assuming that "poor" activities are either eliminated or improved). The determination of these focal areas is one of the purposes of strategic planning. The process of

focusing on a few areas is not simple and difficult decisions are required before the plan can be implemented.

One conclusion the Arizona universities might find is that all their programs will be "good" and a few will be truly excellent. This will necessitate resources to be directed at both categories.

Every institution or organization does some type of planning. It might be as simple as preparing a budget with involvement of only a few people, or it might be a highly structured process involving many people. Formats of a strategic plan could also range from a single page listing of strategic directions to a multi-page document that includes specific goals and objectives for attaining the strategic choices.

The term "strategic planning" is probably overused, and is often incorrectly equated with "long range planning." The two are considerably different in concept, development, and results (Table 2). Long range planning tends to be trend oriented (plus or minus a small amount for uncertainty) and constrains movement into new areas.

Table 2. Differences in Long Range Planning and Strategic Planning*

Long range planning	Strategic Planning
Tradition oriented	Mission oriented
Small changes from past	Dynamic and change oriented
Influenced by budget/governance	Open and participatory
Blueprint of future	Vision of future
Objective data emphasized	Subjective/intuitive data emphasized
Inaction when ambiguous	Proactive even with uncertainty
Internal focus	External focus
Efficiency oriented	Focus on doing the right thing
Planning office develops	Institution-wide development
Relies on tested actions	Opportunity analysis driven
Reactive	Proactive

* Meredith et al. (1987)

Strategic planning offers some special advantages by identifying internal strengths and weaknesses, external opportunities and threats, and finding those areas of overlap to determine a selected few special directions for special institutional guidance. If done skillfully, strategic planning can provide the rationale for difficult decision making; some examples of such choices are listed in Table 3. While it is clear that some programs may not constitute particular strengths or weaknesses, or there may not be special external opportunities, these too need to be in the overall strategic plan.

Table 3. Examples of Decisions Aided by Existence of a Strategic Plan*

- Emphasis on teaching and research (graduate education vs contracts)
- Emphasis on existing strong programs vs needed but weak programs
- Program reviews (academic department(s) and new or existing majors
- Necessary vs unnecessary duplicative programs among the universities
- Emphasis on student recruitment vs retention of current students
- Focus on programs of local vs national vs international significance
- Attention to minority concerns vs management for average population
- Anticipation of new majors and decline of other majors
- Determine if a new activity will add or subtract from vitality
- Justification of allocation of funds among competing demands

* Meredith et al. (1987)

Perhaps strategic planning can be distinguished further by listing two definitions. Cope, (1986) provides the following definition:

"Strategic Planning, a relatively new management tool, is not simply an aggregation of budgets or a collection of management techniques to address all the issues facing an institution. Strategic planning is an open systems approach to steering an enterprise over time through uncertain environmental waters.

It is a proactive problem solving behavior directed externally at conditions in the environment. It is a means to find a favorable comparative position in an industry where there is continual competition for resources. The primary purpose is to link the institution's future to anticipated changes in the environment in such a way that the depletion of resources (money, personnel, students, goodwill..) is slower than the acquisition of new resources.

Keller (1983) offers the following features of strategic planning that distinguish it from other types of planning or management:

1. Academic strategic decision making means that a college, school, or university and its leaders are active rather than passive about their position in history.

2. Strategic planning looks outward and is focused on keeping the institution in step with the changing environment.

3. Academic strategy making is competitive, recognizing that higher education is subject to economic market conditions and to increasingly strong competition.

4. Strategic planning concentrates on decisions, not documented plans, analyses, forecasts, and goals.

5. Strategy making is a blend of rational and economic analysis, political maneuvering, and psychological interplay. It is therefore participatory and highly tolerant of controversy.

6. Strategic planning concentrates on the fate of the institution above everything else. [Note: Keller is making reference to individual institutional plans rather than several institutions under one governing board].

To further define the term, Keller has developed a listing of what strategic planning is not (see "Shaping an Academic Strategy: Examples of Non-planning" in the Background section). A number of universities are engaged in strategic planning activities, with perhaps two dozen really addressing fundamental issues in the true strategic sense. Some have implemented changes as a result.

Selected examples of their approaches are listed in the Background section "Description of Selected Planning Processes for Other Universities."

IMPLEMENTATION

There is no single best approach to strategic planning, and some discussion is required to determine which methods are most appropriate for Arizona. For any process, however, several elements are essential in the planning process. These are:

1. State all assumptions for the planning time frame; confirm the assumptions are reasonable and not mutually contradictory.

2. Involve the principal stakeholders (see Table 4 for examples).

3. Include an appropriate number of employees in the process. These may be principally managers and faculty, but the communication involved in developing the strategic planning factors will better insure that the plan is realistic AND that it will be implemented because those involved in the process will be implementing it.

4. Educate those involved in the process by stating the rationale of the planning exercise and providing workshops in how to develop strategic planning documents. The process is sufficiently new, the meaning is so varied, and the need for communication of options and airing of assumptions so great that this educational element becomes essential to an effective plan.

5. Allow for formulating alternative courses of action, sometimes on short notice, and planning options for uncertainty or seemingly unlikely events.

6. Cause the setting of attainable goals and measurable objectives and the development of monitoring or evaluation mechanisms to track progress.

7. Provide feedback of results to those participating in the process.

The important message is that the process uses realistic assumptions and relevant data, involves a number of people, and develops strategies which are practical given the resources and time frame of the planning effort. See "Content of Typical Strategic Planning Processes" in the Background section for further examples.

Table 4. Examples of Stakeholders Who Might Participate in Planning

Students, faculty, professionals
Administration, staff
Alumni and parents
Arizona business, industry, and citizens
State and local government officials
Funding agencies and professional associations

There are also some agreed upon important criteria for success in a planning process. These are:

1. The process must be endorsed by the senior administration, with no competing processes used for planning and actions;

2. The plan must be used for decision making once it is formalized, and a clear link must exist to the resource allocation and evaluation processes; and

3. The process must be clearly communicated to all relevant parties, particularly to the faculty, and appropriate means for feedback developed for revision of the process or the plan content.

Further, the implementation process must be efficient of people's time and not be perceived as one more report writing exercise.

The choice of a process depends on the purpose of the planning operation. If it is to verify that actions are taken and that the linked programs are evaluated, then a more structured approach is appropriate. If it is for strategic guidance overview and monitoring of results, then a less structured approach is appropriate. While it depends on the institutional situation, it is likely there will be more than one strategic plan. For example, three versions seem plausible:

1. a general document for wide distribution to constituents and clients that provides appropriate background and the few strategic directions;

2. a more detailed document, with supporting documentation, for distribution within the administrative structure of the institution; and

3. a detailed resource allocation design to accomplish the directions raised in the plan (this is an administrative activity and should not be attempted by any planning committees).

While the essential content of the plan would exist in each version, they would differ in the detail and presentation format for the various intended audiences.

Since the mission statement is of primary importance in communicating the overall strategies to employees and others, its content and format are fundamental to

an effective plan. See the Background section "Mission Statement Guidelines" for examples of mission statement components.

ARIZONA UNIVERSITIES' PLANNING ACTIVITIES

BACKGROUND

The most recent formal Long Range Plan was adopted by the Board of Regents in April 1974 ("University Development in the Mid-Seventies: A Long Range Plan").

This 37-page document included board policies relating to enrollment, capital planning, responsibilities of the universities, continuing education, undergraduate and graduate education, research, public service, space use, and physical facilities planning. It also included a listing by college of each university academic plans.

Until 1980, the formal long range planning activities for the universities (collectively through the Board of Regents' office) consisted of academic program approvals, and budget related decisions primarily made on an ad hoc basis. At that time, the first mission and scope statement for each individual university was completed (July, 1980).

This process took three years and was coordinated by the ABOR staff, which provided a set of planning assumptions and general criteria. A substantial amount of useful planning-related information was developed during this process. There was a considerable amount of effort expended by the three universities and the ABOR staff in defining these 1980 mission statements (including the development of goals, priorities, and some institutional profile information).

As the 1984 annual change process for mission statement revisions began, the circumstances changed, with the result that the currently approved mission statements remain the 1983 version. The events included: a substantial process change to include new format and content which was delayed by a Budget Cost Study; the establishment of a new ABOR staff directorate for strategic planning in 1987; a state mandate for a five-year capital plan submission was effected in 1988; and the establishment of this Task Force on Excellence, Efficiency and Competitiveness.

In reviewing the history of planning over the last decade, several planning related points surface:

- There is a good deal of appropriate concern (by both the ABOR staff and the universities) about "duplication" of efforts and the need for different mission statements among the universities. However, some new proposals involve an evaluation process that causes delays for comments by members of each university and the ABOR staff. This concern has contributed to a desire by some of the universities to make their mission statements all inclusive. A clear and functional mission statement could improve the efficiency of this review process.

- The mission statement revision process lacks clarity of direction in format and content (because of an desire to allow "bottom up" definition).

  This is an inefficiency that causes repetitive and frustrating experiences for all involved parties at each subsequent meeting relating to mission development or strategic planning details, as firm guidelines for

developing drafts do not exist (some guidelines are developed on an ad hoc basis but not for overall direction of the full process).[6]

- The decennial program review process and the budget processes vary to the degree in which they are explicitly linked to planning at the university. This produces an atmosphere where there is no perceived need for a planning process, especially one that is guided by a group external to the university (ABOR). In addition, when plans exist there is some frustration on the part of members of the university community because evidence (e.g., feedback) is not obvious that actions were taken as a result of the plan. At the ABOR level, attempts to link the capital and strategic planning processes have produced some duplication of analyses between these two committees.

Other university processes which function as de facto plans (e.g., they serve to allocate resources among programs) include the Capital Plans (five-year projection from 1988) and the annual operating budgets (continuation and program change budgets).

During the past year, the ABOR coordinated planning emphasis has shifted from developing mission statements and overall goals to defining strategic directions at the ABOR level. However, the lack of clear mission statements for ABOR and the universities has hindered this planning process.

While there are examples of broad mission statements, the good ones are sufficiently specific to provide guidance for the institution and understanding for the university constituents.[7] The actual strategic planning process and administrative structure for planning varies at each university.

Documents have been developed during the last several years of the planning process that:

1. Identified some expected changes in internal and external conditions that will be faced by the universities over the next decade (developed by the Academic Affairs Council);

2. Identified methods of program evaluation and resource redistribution (developed by the Academic Affairs Council);

3. Summarized perceptions of various stakeholders toward possible university missions (research study by ASU under contract from ABOR).

Thus, the processes for revising mission statements and more recently for developing strategic plans suffer from this lack of a clear purpose and clarity of content, disagreement on what the fundamental process and implementation of results should be . A full description of the planning activities from 1983 to 1988 is in the Background section "Description of ABOR/Universities Planning Process, 1977-1988."

RELEVANT PLANNING REPORTS

A university's strategic plan should provide overall direction to the institutions, and should reference more detailed planning efforts in such areas as academic programs, capital acquisition, campus physical development, and financing options. Examples where ad hoc or opportunity driven planning has occurred in the last few years are:[8]

JOINT EFFORTS AMONG THREE ARIZONA UNIVERSITIES'

- o Arizona Universities' Study Group on Minority Student Recruitment and Retention
- o Tri-University Task Force on Study Abroad Programs
- o Tri-University Plan and Process for Affirmative Action Job Group Formation
- o Arizona Telecommunication Cooperative Committee
- o Capital Planning Process
- o Joint Meeting on Off-Campus Education
- o Tri-University Life Sciences Plan

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

- o Engineering Excellence Phase I (followed by Phases II and III)
- o Health Administration and Policy Plan
- o Freshman Year Experience Plan
- o Affirmative Action Plan
- o Honors College Plan
- o Academic Achievement Plan
- o Library Plan
- o Physics Plan
- o Capital Improvement Plan
- o Affirmative Action Plan

NORTHERN ARIZONA UNIVERSITY

- o Hotel and Restaurant Management Plan
- o Yuma Branch Campus Proposal
- o Affirmative Action Plan
- o Planning Guide 1989-90
- o Capital Improvement Plan
- o Land Use Plan
- o Master Facilities Plan

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

- o Undergraduate Quality Committee
- o Comprehensive Campus Plan
- o Affirmative Action Plan
- o Academic Advising Committee
- o Teaching Facilities Committee
- o Capital Improvement Plan
- o Assessment of the Quality and Outcomes of Undergraduate Education
- o Information Services Task Force
- o Undergraduate General Studies Committee

CURRENT PLANNING PROCESS

Each of the universities submitted revised mission statements, goals and objectives to the Board of Regents in Fall 1985. The information below describes more recent activities. The ABOR staff, in

concert with the Strategic Planning Council, is developing a "system-wide" strategic plan, while each university is developing its own strategic plan.[10] The institutional plans will then be coupled with the ABOR plan so state-wide needs are incorporated into the specific university plans.

ARIZONA BOARD OF REGENTS

The Board Strategic Planning Committee was formed in 1984, and in 1986 three Future Needs of the State subcommittees developed reports.[11] The ABOR has also had annual planning retreats for several years, hired consultants in matters of planning, capital, personnel, and information handling, and appointed the Task Force on Excellence, Efficiency and Competitiveness. The current strategic planning process for the ABOR became much more active in FY 88. In this last year, the responsibilities of the Strategic Planning Committee were identified, a "Typology of Instructional Centers" (guidelines for branch campuses and off-campus centers) was developed, general planning assumptions were produced, and the universities were asked to revise their mission and scope statements. The ABOR is in the process of developing a system-wide mission and procedures for identifying areas of special emphasis within the universities.

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

During FY 88 a process was developed to produce a strategic plan, consisting of an estimated 30 or so pages, by the end of the academic year. The process began with development of a Mission and Scope statement. Faculty, staff, deans, and vice presidents were asked to comment on the 1985 draft mission statement submitted to the Board of Regents. Deans and Vice Presidents established mission and scope statements by college and vice presidential area. A university-wide planning committee refined the overall mission and scope statement and sought further faculty review before finally submitting the document to the Board of Regents in early 1988. The preparation of the document involved an environmental scanning process and ABOR priorities. Individual administrative and academic units developed goals and strategies for achieving the goals, with final review by the university-wide Strategic Planning Committee. The 5-year strategic plan will include these goals, capital improvement recommendations, and a 5-year budget, with provisions for annual updates.

In absence of a strategic plan, the annual Program Change budgets serve as a major indicator of new directions. Guidance for these program change budget requests are based on vice presidential area and subsequent submissions are narrowed in number through review at the vice presidential level. They are then reviewed by the Council of Vice Presidents for final submission to the ABOR.

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY WEST

ASU West was established as a branch campus in 1984 by Senate Bill 1245 after about a decade of discussion of the need for a campus in west metropolitan Phoenix. The campus has established a separate strategic plan (about 30 pages) which after multiple versions is in final draft stages for inclusion in the ASU strategic plan. It includes an overall vision of the future of the campus, a mission, history, an assessment of external environmental conditions and their implications, principles for guiding

goal development, institutional goals and strategies (by campus and individual academic and administrative units), and a statement on achieving the mission through the strategic planning process.

NORTHERN ARIZONA UNIVERSITY

The NAU planning process has developed over several years, first in the administrative areas and more recently in the academic areas. Annual revisions in university mission and goals are developed by the senior administration with review by the Council of Councils (representingallacademic/administrative units), followed by routing to deans, directors, and departments heads (by way of a planning guide). This guidance for changes in programs or initiation of new program change requests then is resubmitted and prioritized at the vice presidential level.

Final program change requests are identified by the Budget Development Committee, which also links planning and budgeting. The process involves annual revisions in goals and specific objectives by academic and administrative units and resource reallocation based on evaluation of these revisions. Closely linked to the development of these goals is a process for reviewing the strengths and weaknesses of the institution and identification of external opportunities and threats as they relate to specific programmatic changes. The University Planning Committee develops draft statements for new directions, which undergo further review by the Vice Presidents' Council.

Guidance is given in the Program Change budget cycle by a required linking of new or expanded programs to supporting goals for the unit and university.

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

A formalization of strategic planning began in FY 83 with individual discussions between the Provost and college deans. The subjects included priorities and definition of issues and needs. This same procedure was followed in FY 84, and in FY 85 planning statements were prepared by each college for incorporation into university-wide goals and objectives. Priorities were identified for a 3-5 year period and mission statements were revised at the college level. In FY 86 a draft strategic planning document was developed that included the planning environment, approaches to planning, implementation procedures, and a departmental planning guide.

Beginning in FY 87 each college prepared a revised mission statement, identified its strengths and weaknesses, and listed its external opportunities and threats. In addition, each college specified strategic issues for the next 3-5 years. In FY 88 revised mission, scope, and means statements were prepared. The overall process was developed in concert with deans and departments, and engaged a committee of associate deans for detailed discussions. The process was suspended and restarted during the last two years because of uncertainty related to Board of Regents procedures in planning.

The Program Change budget cycle is left open to all participants. Submissions are ranked at the departmental and college level, but all submissions are reviewed by the President's Council.

CURRENT STATUS OF PLANNING DOCUMENTS[12]

The planning process has become very active and is still developing. For example, in response to a request from the ABOR staff, the universities submitted in February 1988 the most recent planning statement. The previous submission of Mission and Scope statements by the universities was in fall 1985. All these documents are draft, as the current official mission statement remains the 1983 version. These current statements also vary in content and format and are summarized briefly below.

ARIZONA BOARD OF REGENTS

The 9-page draft Arizona University System mission and scope statement was developed in the last several months and is expected to be final draft in late June 1988; the draft includes a brief background statement, a mission of the Arizona University System, and six strategic directions (to heighten the quality of Arizona's public university system by continuing to build three distinguished institutions; to improve the quality of undergraduate education; to develop and strengthen research activities and graduate programs; to extend access to a public university education, especially to under--represented racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic groups; to strengthen the connections of the universities to the community colleges and the K-12 sector; and to increase the contributions of the university system to the economic development of Arizona. It is anticipated that these strategic directions would last for 3-5 years and be replaced by other directions on a continuing basis.

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

A 39-page document in four sections: ASU overall mission and scope (the Arizona State University System), ASU Main Campus mission and scope, West Campus mission and scope, and a series of appendixes (environmental scan, enrollment management, and support services). The document provides some enrollment guidance and designates disciplinary areas for additional emphasis (between 25 and 50 depending on definition). There are specific notations on internal weaknesses relative to support services.

NORTHERN ARIZONA UNIVERSITY

A 30-page document is in two major sections: A 3-page mission and scope statement and a 27-page listing of goals and subgoals for the university and each college. Included is a description of the type of university and areas of program emphasis. Specific results of an environmental scan or internal weaknesses are not stated at this time.

In addition, NAU has developed three documents for the strategic planning process: 1) Environmental Scanning (a 9-page external scanning and internal program review), 2) Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation Process Summary (a 13-page description of the these processes), and 3) Planning Guide 1989-90 (a 44-page guide for completion by academic and administrative units) includes worksheets, mission and goals for university and individual colleges.

While these have been in development for several years, the current versions were produced in the Spring of 1988 and have now been expanded for use campus-wide. There is also an "Issues Notebook" which contains one page of

executive summaries resulting from the environmental scanning process on specific subjects, and will be enlarged to a complete summary of environmental scanning and internal assessment results in Spring 1989.

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

A 118-page document is in three sections: mission, means, scope. The mission statement includes 19 pages of introduction, history, aspirations, student description, academic program description, and organized research and public service descriptions. The means section includes six pages relating to intellectual leadership, faculty and staff, the campus, and planning and evaluation. The scope section includes 101 pages of mission/description-/emerging areas of individual colleges, organized research units, academic support units, public service units, student service units, and agricultural units. There are no references to specific external trends or internal weaknesses, but internal strengths are cited.

DISCUSSION

SUMMARY

There has been considerable effort expended on university planning in the last 15 years. The steps leading to the 1974 Long Range Plan (16 month process), the first mission and scope statement in 1980 (3 year process), and the strategic planning process begun in 1984 (process not complete) have caused a number of meetings and exchanges of documents. Each planning project has had its benefits and each has taken place in a different setting of external and internal university conditions. There has been a lot of effort expended in human terms and the results are partly measured in increased awareness of the issues and partly in the written drafts for revising the currently approved 1983 mission and scope statement. The written results vary widely in the clarity and focus of missions of the universities.

Improvements in the process might include more attention given to developing a consensus about the key ingredients of a successful planning activity and developing a better understanding of the differences between strategic and long range planning.

A NEW DEFINITION: STRATEGIC PLAN AND ACTION PLAN

Because of the possibility of easing into a traditional "long range" planning process, it might be best to avoid use of the term "long range." The planning process could result in two documents (or two portions of a single document):

- Strategic plan (short document with key choices and rationale made clear),
- Action plan (long document with specific goals, objectives, and methods of achieving the strategic plan).

This would allow the strategic plan to be revised less frequently (perhaps 1-3 years, depending on the degree of change), and to be really strategic in nature. The action plan could then be revised annually and contain the necessary detail for successful implementation of the strategic plan.

SPECIAL CONCERNS TO ADDRESS BY A STRATEGIC PLAN

A strategic planning process focuses on the major choices to make rather than cataloging specific objectives (that is developed in an associated Action Plan). Some examples of the issues to address in such a process include:

- Undergraduate quality and citizen access (including the impacts of enrollment caps either at the college or university level).
- Academic program selections for new resource allocation based on: 1) maintaining excellence, 2) achieving excellence for departments already good, 3) maintaining average effort, 4) maintaining minimal effort, and 5) phasing out a program (or combining with another department).
- Academic program selections for emphasis based on national or international audiences compared to state audiences.
- Relative emphasis on programmatic choices (e.g., building disciplines) or on infrastructure (e.g., building support activities).
- Determining university-wide priorities vs college priorities.
- Determining sequence of capital project funding and resource availabilities.
- Determining the administrative and management structure of the university and its operating units in relation to other changes made during the planning process and changes in information technology and management options.

PLANNING PITFALLS

While the essential ingredients for successful strategic planning have been discussed, it is worth repeating a few factors that may guarantee failure if they are not addressed. Activities to avoid include:

- Any process that does not have the clear support of the senior administration in the developmental stages and use by senior administration in the completed stages; this support must be communicated to all parties.
- Any process that develops a simple wish list for all wants; the areas for focus must be few or insufficient resources will be available for developing those areas.
- Any process that does not honestly identify external changes and internal weaknesses, or consider realistic assumptions.
- Any process that does not involve the faculty and other stakeholders throughout the planning effort.
- Any process that is perceived as being a bureaucratic exercise; if this is the case the results will not be the same as when the interest is present.

A few special planning activities which Arizona should be especially aware include:

- The importance of stating and agreeing on planning assumptions among the relevant parties;
- The need for careful attention to special opportunities and or threats for Arizona universities which relate to

possible futures for the state;

If the process misses any of these features, it might as well not be referenced as a strategic planning process.

TWO APPROACHES TO COORDINATED PLANNING

The Arizona universities have been able to function relatively independently for a long time, and this is a strength (noted by several Task Force consultants). In other states, this type of "hands off" organizational structure has allowed for the strongest universities as well.

Therefore the approach to planning should preserve this relationship and should be efficient with a minimization of effort. On the other hand, the universities need involvement by the Board of Regents in the institutional planning process. The Board has the oversight of institutional planning as is one of the Boards' major obligations; it also provides a process to connect the universities to the social and political needs of the state in ways that augment the university activities in these areas.

The current approach has only recently been developed and is still undergoing discussion. Assumptions for any approach are that

1) university strategic choices need to be made,

2) university goals must be related to a series of measurable objectives, and

3) each university must develop a tracking procedure to monitor progress. Within that framework, there are two distinct approaches that could be taken.

EXAMPLE 1: BOARD ORIENTED

The Board could identify "state needs" that might be in addition to the priorities developed by the universities. The Board could then require that the universities specify how institutional priorities will be linked to the Board identified needs. The Board could require specific goals and measurable objectives at the institutional level to link with the state need, and could include specific resource estimates for the planning period. The advantage of this process is that the Board is better assured of success for the participants in meeting the goals but the disadvantage is that the process will cause more staff effort at all levels.

EXAMPLE 2: UNIVERSITY ORIENTED

The universities could identify "state needs" in addition to institutional interests through the strategic planning process. The Board could then encourage the universities to incorporate these state needs within the university priorities. The Board could monitor the institutions to confirm that they are adequately addressing the state needs as well as meeting the universities' own goals and objectives. The advantage of this process is that the universities are accountable to the Board but can avoid additional details of paper handling. The disadvantage is the Board does not have a direct link in university activities directed toward state needs.

A CHOICE

A combination of both approaches seems to adequately address the concerns of both the Board and the universities, and would allow an efficient process. This also could involve the joint identification of state needs by the Board and the universities. As the Board sets

selected goals (goal is more appropriate than strategy in this context) for the Arizona universities, it will be clear to the universities that they should incorporate some of those goals into university directions. The budget allocation process (continuing or program change) allows the Board appropriate review of university decisions on an annual basis.

The universities could identify their own goals and objectives that relate to the Board goals, with the Board formally approving those institutional goals and objectives.

However, care should be taken to separate strategic planning from long range or tactical planning. It is easy to confuse these two processes. The strategic planning should be done less often (major review each 3-5 years) and the "action plan" for implementation should be specific and revised annually.

An evaluation process for each strategic plan (e.g., each institution and ABOR) must be a third component to the planning activities. Without separating these activities, there is danger in losing the "strategic" portion of the process.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Each university currently has a planning process. These processes vary by university and the resulting plans vary. Some are clearly articulated to a broad group, some are discussed informally with a wide group but not formally communicated, some are detailed and others are general in structure and format; all are under revision.

2. A good deal of activity has been generated in the planning activities over the last 15 years with some useful guidance documents developed. However, in recent years planning suffers from a lack of defined process and a perceived lack of genuine commitment in some institutions. There seems to be a sense of frustration based on the amount of work undertaken relative to the (lack of) planning products in place.

3. The current budget process allows the flexibility required (in the continuation budget and program change budget) to provide resource redirection based upon the strategic planning actions.

4. The mission statement is a fundamental document to provide guidance to the other components of a strategic plan, but the Arizona university system mission statement and the university's mission statements have not been formally approved prior to actions taken on more detailed planning efforts. The mission and accompanying few strategic directions constitute the vehicle for broad communication of future university movement. To be accepted in the end, the mission statement and the key elements of the plan require that the relevant constituencies of the universities be involved in their development from the earliest stages.

5. The planning process should produce clearly stated and understood strategic directions (at both the university level and the ABOR level).

   These directions should be expressed in such a manner to allow tracking of progress but also allow for special areas of action when warranted within the context of the overall strategic plan. If the plan is too imprecise,

makes reference to directions that are not achievable, or contains too great detail, it will not be functional.

6. The universities generally have evolved without the need for a formal strategic plan. This was successful in the past primarily because of the external conditions (e.g., funding availability) and internal goals and choices (driven both by individual opportunities and concerted efforts).

   However, the future portends to be more uncertain, resource attainment more difficult, the delayed impacts of earlier years of growth are becoming evident, and the changes in the academic disciplines and needs of society are becoming evident.

7. The current planning process has been evolving since 1983, when a major change of approach was taken. From the earliest times of this process, there has been confusion regarding format and approach (as indicated by questions in meeting minutes) and required clarification of the format and procedure has been requested by the participants; this situation persists.

8. The budget is the most basic planning instrument and reflects broader planning efforts (e.g., capital planning, academic planning). It also reflects the results of specialized studies (e.g., branch campus, new undergraduate curricula), and it the reflects results of internal periodic reviews. However, there is generally no clearly stated, integrating, long-term futures oriented, strategic plan for the universities or the ABOR.

9. Funding variation through the state appropriation process has been significant, causing disruptions in planning as well as annual operating activities. In the last 10 years, the range of budget changes for individual campuses has been -5.1 to +22.6 percent. In 4 of the last 7 years (FY 82-88), the budget has been revised down during the year for which it was appropriated. This makes planning and operating difficult and suggests some fundamental flaw in the funding process (e.g., the high reliance on sales taxes in the state tax structure allows greater shifts in resources as the economic conditions shift).

10. For the Board of Regents to provide adequately for oversight of the planning process, the Board will have to identify and discuss the relevant questions to ask, the types of information to assimilate to address the questions, and the format for final presentation. The ABOR should approve the types of data to be collected to develop that convey the needed information. Collection of data without first identifying these questions will lead to inefficient use of the Board, Board staff and university resources. Further effort will be needed during this process to carefully identify the uses of the data because of slightly different definitions or limitations by virtue of its collection method.

11. The Arizona universities have different histories, areas of emphasis, constituencies, and opportunities. Accordingly, they are likely to have different futures and the planning related activities should acknowledge these distinctions. This means there will be duplication of some programs

where the external need and internal capabilities are demonstrated through the strategic planning process.

12. Activities related to university planning involve the ABOR staff and the three universities in a number of ways, including academic program and degree changes, decision packages/program changes, and service areas. The multiple levels of interaction during these processes are done in such a manner as to increase the competition AMONG the universities and to increase meetings and discussion times in absence of more focused guidance (e.g., mission statement and strategic plan).

13. The strategic planning "results" are still in development, but the 5-year capital plan has been approved (because of the state mandate for such a plan). When the strategic planning process is sufficiently far along, the capital plan should be revised (this is the intent of the ABOR).

The current Board of Regents' Policy on Building Construction, Remodeling, and Renovation (approved January 1988) has several links to the strategic planning actions for the Board. These actions are: a) approve project initiation by Board Strategic Planning Committee; b) annual review/update of strategic plan by university for major goals, proposed objectives; c) define capital projects necessary to achieve an objective; d) strategic plans shall identify major capital and operating implications of key strategies (where the capital must contribute to specific objectives or meet other important criteria); and e) multiple involvement of the Board Strategic Planning Committee and the Capital Review Committee on facilities requests.

This process is new and the duplication in part is due to the capital process getting ahead of the strategic planning process. At the present time it leads to duplicate reviews (although at different levels of detail) and increased paperwork. These processes should be reviewed at the completion of the strategic plan (ABOR intends to do this).

14. The planning process has been inefficient because of a) competing activities requiring heavy resource commitments from the Board staff and that of the universities, b) a change of definition of the process from the currently approved "plan" of June, 1983, with differing instructions and limited format suggestions, c) varying degrees of "education" for the campus community about the rationale and need for planning and involvement of external constituencies, and d) movement of issues detail without clarifying the overall process and focusing on key elements.

15. The strategic planning process is variable among the campuses in the approach, content, format, participants, and administrative support.

16. While planning improvements are being undertaken, major events are addressed inadequately relative to the impacts on the universities (or state) for the next decade or so. A recent example is

the envisioned venture with Sematec Corporation, where the ABOR and the universities identified commitments that might have significant impacts (both positive and negative) had they been more fully evaluated. Because of the scale of this project, the full impact on the universities would have been better understood if a strategic plan and an impact analysis process had been in place. For activities of this magnitude, there are implications that are not obvious on initial analysis. The planning process could provide a framework for making decisions on future projects of this scale.

17. Goals of the Board of Regents are not published consistently on an annual basis, although they are discussed informally. For example, in the last 5 years goals were publicized (through Regents' newsletter) only for FY 85 and FY 86.

18. The universities and the Board of Regents' office are undergoing rapid enhancement of information handling capabilities for better support of decision making.

19. The information transmitted presently to the Board of Regents' office by the universities is not identical in definition, represents different formats, and lacks clear submission requirements. The data categories developed by each university for internal studies and submission to the board are similar (but still different).

20. The information available in the Board of Regents office is not centrally cataloged for easy identification and retrieval and computerization is not applied to all available relevant data. A project titled "Arizona Regents' Information System (ARIS)" is currently addressing this concern.

RECOMMENDATIONS [13]

- THE ABOR SHOULD DEMAND, BUT NOT NECESSARILY SPECIFICALLY STRUCTURE, A STRATEGIC PLANNING PROCESS AND PROVIDE FOR OVERSIGHT OF ITS SUBSEQUENT ACTIVITIES; THIS IS ONE OF THE MOST IMPORTANT FUNCTIONS OF A GOVERNING BOARD.

  A strategic planning process is underway and should be reviewed as soon as possible after completion of this Task Force study; at that time additional Task Force developed information will be available and the current process will be sufficiently defined to warrant assessment. Special care should be taken to incorporate other planning into strategic planning (e.g., capital), as well as evaluate mission statements, and realistic assessments of external demands and opportunities and internal strengths and weaknesses. While the specific structure of the planning process should be left to the universities, the ABOR should require that the principle components of the plan be defined and agreed to by all parties.

- THE BOARD SHOULD EVALUATE THE MOST APPROPRIATE MANNER TO REVIEW FUTURE STRATEGIC PLANNING ACTIVITIES AFTER THE CURRENT STRATEGIC PLAN IS DEVELOPED.

  The current strategic planning process will move to a new phase within a year or so. Since the role of strategic planning is involved across all committees of the Board, an evaluation should be completed for making the Board Strategic Planning Committee a committee of the whole and limit its activities to strategic (rather than operational or routine) issues and choices.

- THE RESPECTIVE PLANNING ROLES OF THE BOARD, THE BOARD STAFF, AND THE PRESIDENTS OF THE UNIVERSITIES SHOULD BE IDENTIFIED.

  These roles should be defined in advance of beginning the planning process in earnest. When each party fully understands and agrees to the roles of the other parties, the planning process will move along more smoothly.

- THE PLANNING PROCESS SHOULD BE STRATEGIC IN NATURE.

  The role of the Board of Regents should be limited to policy related issues and oversight, with implementation details developed by the individual universities. While the Board should develop and communicate its own strategic directions for itself (in addition to those of the universities), the Board should focus on providing oversight capability for evaluation of the strategic directions. Care should be taken to avoid detailed data collection activities or rule based responses that may be not be central to strategy development or monitoring of progress. Specific implementation procedures might be referred to as "action plans" to maintain the "strategic" nature of the planning process.

- THE UNIVERSITIES SHOULD LINK PLANNING TO THE BUDGET PROCESS AND PROGRAM ASSESSMENT AND REVIEW WHILE DEVELOPING SUPPORTING MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS.

  The planning processes vary among the universities in their linking planning to budget decisions and assessment outcomes. Such links must be established and followed if the planning process is to be considered effective.

- THE BOARD OF REGENTS AND THE UNIVERSITIES NEED TO COMMUNICATE THEIR MISSION (SYSTEM-WIDE AND INSTITUTION SPECIFIC) AND STRATEGIES TO ALL CONSTITUENTS.

  Once a series of strategic choices have been developed, with appropriate involvement of the various constituencies, the results should be widely communicated. This would remove the current uncertainty and mixed signals some receive in absence of explicit mission statements or university directions.

- THE UNIVERSITIES SHOULD PROVIDE SELECTED EXISTING AND RELEVANT INFORMATION TO THE ABOR FOR PLANNING OVERSIGHT PURPOSES.

Such information should be forwarded to the Board staff and the other two universities. It would include copies of relevant reports already requested by external groups (the most important of these [IPEDS for the US Department of Education] is already shared with the Board staff). These data could then comprise a small database for the Board staff to initiate oversight activities of a number of university activities that cumulatively comprise the strategic planning components. These data should be officially reported by a knowledgeable professional and not relegated to a clerical function (unless clearly stated procedures are developed to maintain data quality). Additional data could be developed by ad hoc studies done for planning activities or other purposes. Where forecasting is necessary to develop data, ranges and associated discussion should be provided to understand the limitations and possible variations. The intent of this recommendation is not to provide ALL data to ABOR that is presently sent to other groups, but to suggest that a good deal of data presently exists that could be provided to assist the ABOR in its oversight role.

- THE UNIVERSITIES SHOULD CONTINUE THEIR DEVELOPMENT OF IMPROVED DECISION SUPPORT SYSTEMS AND THE BOARD OF REGENTS SHOULD DEVELOP AND MAINTAIN A LIMITED DATABASE FOR ANALYZING AGGREGATE DATA DEVELOPED BY THE UNIVERSITIES.

Only data that is necessary for appropriate information development should be collected by the Board of Regents rather than duplication of detailed data systems of individual universities. The necessary data for most information needs are already submitted by the universities to the Regents so do not require any significant additional workload on the part of the universities. It is important that the purpose and collection process of such data exchange are identified and understood by all interested parties at project initiation.

- THE BOARD OF REGENTS SHOULD SPECIFY A MINIMUM CONTENT AND FORMAT FOR THE UNIVERSITY FACT BOOKS.

  Each university and the Board produce an annual fact book. The types of information varies by content and format, and the books vary by size. After a minimum amount of required data are presented, additional university determined data could be included. The current procedure does not provide sufficient similarity in presentation, content, and definition to allow the Board of Regents easy comparison and understanding of relevant trends.

- THE BOARD OF REGENTS SHOULD DEFINE WHAT SUBSTANTIVE QUESTIONS THEY WOULD LIKE ESSENTIAL SUPPORTING INFORMATION FOR (INCLUDING THE FORM AND BASIC CONTENT) AND REQUEST BOARD STAFF TO IDENTIFY WHAT TYPES OF INFORMATION WOULD SATISFY THE REQUEST, THUS ALLOWING THE REGENTS' STAFF AND UNIVERSITY STAFF'S TO DETERMINE THE TYPES OF DATA TO COLLECT.

  In this context, it is assumed the purpose of data collection and its conversion to useful information formats is to improve decision making by the by the universities as well as

the Board of Regents but not to the point of the overall system becoming overwhelmed in data collection and transmission.

- THE BOARD OF REGENTS SHOULD REQUIRE A MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING CONCERNING DATA DEFINITIONS BETWEEN THE REGENT'S STAFF AND THE UNIVERSITIES.

  Such a memorandum of understanding should be developed among the universities and the Regent's staff to clarify the specific definition of the types of data submitted to the Regents.

REFERENCES

Astin, Alexander W. 1986. Competition or Cooperation? Change Magazine, September-October, 12-19.

Bryson, John M. 1988. Strategic Planning for Public and Nonprofit Organizations: A Guide to Strengthening and Sustaining Organizational Achievement. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco. 335 p.

Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education (Final Report). 1980. Three Thousand Futures: The Next Twenty Years for Higher Education. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco. 439 p.

Carpenter, Don A. 1987. Role and Mission Development: A Comparison of Different Approaches. Prepared for State Higher Education Executive Officers Task Force on Role and Mission, Denver, Colorado. 14 p.

Caruthers, J. Kent. 1987. Mission Maintenance: Tools for Change and the Consultative Process. Prepared for State Higher Education Executive Officers Task Force on Role and Mission, Denver, Colorado. 16 p.

Chaffee, Ellen Earle. 1987. System Strategy and Effectiveness. Prepared for State Higher Educations Executive Officers Task Force on Role and Mission, Denver, Colorado. 37 p.

Drucker, Peter. 1978. The Age of Discontinuity: Guidelines to Our Changing Society. Harper & Row Publishers, New York. 402 p.

Fenske, Robert H. 1980. Setting Institutional Goals and Objectives, in Approving Academic Management: A Handbook of Planning and Institutional Research, edited by Paul Jedamus and Marvin Peterson, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco. 701 p.

Glaser, Susan and Anna Eblen. 1986. Organizational Communication Effectiveness: The View of Corporate Administrators. Journal of Applied Communication Research 14(2):119-132.

Keller, George. 1983. Academic Strategy: The Management Revolution in American Higher Education, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore. 211 p.

Lozier, G. Gregory and Kumar Chittipeddi. 1986. Issues Management in Strategic Planning. Research in Higher Education 24(1):3-14.

McGill, Mollie A. and Richard W. Jonsen. 1988. State Higher Education Policies in the Information Age. Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, Denver. 105 p.

Meredith, Mark, Robert Cope, and Oscar Lenning. 1987. Distinguishing Bona Fide Strategic Planning from Other Planning.

Presented to Annual Meeting of Association for Institutional Research. 24 p.

Meredith, Mark, Oscar Lenning, and Robert Cope. 1988. After Six Years, Does Strategic Planning Make Any Difference?. Presented to Annual Meeting of Association for Institutional Research. 12 p.

Newman, Frank. 1987. Choosing Quality. Education Commission of the States, Denver, Colorado.

Norris, Donald M. 1984. A Guide for New Planners. Society for College and University Planning, Ann Arbor, Michigan. 46 p.

Smith, Perry M., Jerrold P. Allen, John H. Stewart II, and F. Douglas Whitehouse. 1987. Creating Strategic Vision: Long-Range Planning for National Security. National Defense University Press, Washington, D.C. 133 p.

Tucker, Allan. 1984. Chairing the Academic Department. MacMillan Publishing Company, New York. 398 p.

PART II

BACKGROUND

UNIVERSITIES IN TRANSITION

The universities in Arizona have undergone significant change in a relatively short time (about two decades). While many universities in other states have suffered enrollment declines or budget constraints, and will continue to do so, the Arizona universities have benefited from a growing state, aggressive university leadership, and an increasing national and international reputation. The changes underway in the universities are not occurring simply because of this general growth, but also through elimination of old programs or courses and addition of new ones.[14] The universities are complex institutions that undergo continual change. Some of this change is demand driven (e.g., changes in courses, degree offerings), some is planned (e.g., focus in a few disciplines), some is opportunistic (e.g., selection of an option when conditions are favorable), and some is caused by external factors (e.g., budget reductions). As an example of this continual change a listing of the numbers of courses and programs changed in the last five years is in Tables 5-6.[15]

Table 5. Changes in University Programs and Courses FY 84-88

	New Courses			Deleted Courses			Add Deg Prog			Delete Deg Prog		
Year	ASU	NAU	U A	ASU	NAU	U A	ASU	NAU	U A	ASU	NAU	U A
FY 88	58	6	12	17	0	0	0	1	5	1	1	1
FY 87	124	62	197	1	35	343	1	2	9	3	3	5
FY 86	13	0	45	14	0	6	2	0	1	0	2	3
FY 85	96	9	429	168	117	363	2	1	3	1	2	4
FY 84	37	44	116	0	35	16	3	2	1	1	0	0

Table 6. Changes in Centers and Sunset Reviews of Programs

	Centers/Labs Additions			---- Sunset Reviews ---- Continue			Disband		
Year	ASU	NAU	U A	ASU	NAU	U A	ASU	NAU	U A
FY 88	3	0	0	2	0	3	0	1	2
FY 87	2	1	2	4	2	3	0	0	2
FY 86	0	0	1	3	0	3	1	0	1
FY 85	3	2	2	6	2	3	2	1	2
FY 84	3	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0

There are several major elements to the changing conditions for Arizona universities that are important background elements for any discussion of strategic planning.

First, for all practical purposes the number of universities is changing. In FY 1985 the first separately budgeted branch campus was developed as Arizona State University West, and in FY 89 an off-campus center was requested as Northern Arizona University, Yuma (initial request was for a branch campus). In the last decade, small urban locations have been established by ASU

in Phoenix and by UA in Sierra Vista. These changes now effectively provide for three main campuses, one medical school, one branch campus built as a new campus, one off-campus center combined with the physical plant of a community college in a rural county (Yuma), an off-campus site as a downtown center, and an off-campus center in a rural county (Sierra Vista).

The origins of these campuses and the management of their future will require greater understanding of the growth dynamics within and outside the Arizona universities. They also represent an opportunity to evaluate which approach might be most appropriate as the demand for university services begin to rapidly increase in the latter part of this century.

Second, the growth rate of the universities has been significant. Following a national pattern of notable increases in higher education, the Arizona universities' enrollments grew rapidly from 1955 to about 1975, then had a moderate growth until the late 1980s. During this 30-year period, the relative percent of graduate students increased (although it has remained relatively constant during the last decade), the percent of part time students increased (this continues), and the state population grew rapidly.

Because of the demographic changes taking place in the United States and in Arizona, the growth rate of the Arizona universities over the next 15 years cannot be determined by a simple extrapolation of past experiences.

Third, the Arizona universities have changed their focus and their vision of the future. The University of Arizona was designated (and retains) the land grant status at establishment (1885). Arizona State University was originally designated as the Territorial Normal School (1885) and after other names was changed to university status in 1958. Northern Arizona University was established as Northern Arizona Normal School (1889) and after other changes was converted to university status in 1966. These status changes for two of the universities have come during a period of rapid enrollment increase and changing external demands on all the universities. The impacts of this rapid growth have placed stresses on the university support systems; these impacts continue today.

Fourth, the changes occurring in the state, nation, and world are affecting the universities. Multiple demands are placed on a university today, including accountability for and assessment of student learning; research and technology cooperative efforts with business, government, and industry; development of a quality educational experience that includes growth in technical knowledge, broad understanding of societal history and emerging issues, and critical thinking and communicating skills; access of disadvantaged students (e.g., by race, income, geographical location, pre-college preparation) and retention of students after enrollment.

These demands require increased resource expenditures (human, physical plant, and financial), limit flexibility of administrative choice, and invite oversight by others into university management activities. There are also changing economic conditions (e.g., national debt, international trade, and internationalization of the economy), changing demographic trends (e.g., increasing minority population, aging baby boom population), a changing

structure of the economy (e.g., greater service jobs, high debt service, increased high technology), and shifts in college majors desired by students. These factors raise questions about which directions to take and how to adequately fund them.

Fifth, primary funding for capital construction has shifted from state funded to university bonding over the last decade; early bonding was limited to auxiliary activities (e.g., dormitories) and is now available for all types of construction (Table 7).

Table 7. State Appropriations vs Bonding for Capital[17]
(Millions of Dollars)

Years	Bonding	State Capital Appropriations
FY 68-73	6.4	62.0
FY 74-78	18.0	44.0
FY 79-83	142.0	51.0
FY 84-88	229.0	39.0

The recently approved Capital Improvement Plan for FY 89-93 (Tables 8-9) summarizes the significant expansion plans for each of the universities in the near term. These major growth enhancements come at a time when there are no formal strategic plans in place for the universities.

Table 8. ASU and ASU west 5-Year Capital Improvement Plans[18]
(Millions of Dollars)

Fiscal Year	ASU Request	ASU Total %	ASUW Request	ASUW Total %
1989	77.8	38.6	$ 19.2	40.0
1990	5.4	2.7	25.8	53.7
1991	66.2	32.8	1.2	2.5
1992	39.3	19.5	1.4	2.9
1993	13.0	6.4	0.4	0.8
Total	201.7	100.0	48.0	100.0

Table 9. NAU and UA 5-Year Capital Improvement Plans[19]
(Millions of Dollars)

Fiscal Year	NAU Request	NAU Total %	U A Request	U A Total %
1989	$ 21.6	38.2%	$84.7	30.2%
1990	13.7	24.2	50.3	17.9
1991	5.6	9.9	45.3	16.1
1992	12.3	21.7	52.6	18.7
1993	3.0	5.3	15.1	5.4
Total	56.6	100.0	280.3	100.0

It is important to place each of these items in an overall framework in which to understand the changing environment. Although the universities have undergone significant changes, they retain the characteristics of historic development patterns.

This factor is significant, because the pathway into new strategic directions will be influenced by the current structure and activities of the university. For example, the current degree productivity of the three campuses is focused in a few disciplines (Table 10) and the major selections of new Program Change requests in the annual budget cycle are significantly different for each university (Table 11). In addition, the changes in the external environment will have a significant influence on how the universities choose to direct their resources. The infrastructure entries for ASU, ASUW and NAU (academic or administrative staff/support) are grouped because that is the way the program changes were requested.

Table 10. Disciplinary Degree Focus by Arizona Universities*
(Percents are in parentheses and indicate BS/MS/PhD as percent of degrees of the three types).

ASU		NAU		U A	
Business	30/18/11	Business	19/8/0	Business	25/10/3
Education	11/22/40	Education	5/60/82	Engineering	15/13/8
Engineering	8/11/10	Communications	7/0/0	Education	7/25/16

Listed in order of decreasing undergraduate degree amounts over 2-year period FY 86 and FY87; only top three degree areas listed. Categories defined by Higher Education General Index

Table 11. Program Change Subject Focus by Arizona Universities*
(Subjects found in top 50% of Request Dollars)

University	Subject	Percent
ASU	Academic Staff/Support	21
	Engineering	20
	Administration Staff/Support	17
ASUW	Academic Staff/Support	52
NAU	Academic Staff/Support	19
	Computing	17
	General Undergraduate	10
	Off-campus Instruction	9
U A	Biological Sciences	24
	Physical Sciences	16
	Engineering	15

*Summary of nine year period FY 81-FY 89, based on total funding requested by university to ABOR; this does not represent actual funding. Not including University of Arizona College of Medicine (where all subjects are listed as medically related). ASU west represents 5 years of data.

However, they can be broken down into the disciplines but are still in the

"support" category rather than building new programs. The UA tends to list program development by individual discipline and requires less "infrastructure" requests because of a lesser growth rate and longer history of university status.

SHAPING AN ACADEMIC STRATEGY: EXAMPLES OF NON-PLANNING"[1]

The following 10 comments on what a plan "should not be" were developed by George Keller. These points combined with other examples of what a plan "should be" serve to better define the development and uses of a strategic plan.

1. IT IS NOT THE PRODUCTION OF A BLUEPRINT

   The idea is not to produce a fat, detailed document that everyone should follow but to get all the key people thinking innovatively and acting strategically, with the future in mind. Strategic planning involves continuous adjustments to shifting conditions, with a central strategy in mind. The strategic plan may be very simple, like General George Marshall's core strategy of beating Nazi Germany first, then defeating Japan. It is often a matter of a few concepts on paper or a few pages of typescript.

2. IT IS NOT A SET OF PLATITUDES

   Often an institution's goals are given as the education of youth; the training of critical thinkers; or teaching, research, and service. This is like saying you believe in liberty or have faith. Strategic planning means the formulation of succinctly stated operational aims.' It is specific, not vague and vapid.

3. IT IS NOT THE PERSONAL VISION OF THE PRESIDENT OR BOARD OF TRUSTEES

   A strategy is based on calculations about the markets for your services and probable external conditions such as the economy's vitality, population changes, and the preferences of political leaders and state board of higher education officials, as well as your institution's traditions, academic strengths, and financial ability. An academic strategy will of necessity include a measure of the president's own vision, sometimes a huge measure, but never to the exclusion of considerations of other realities.

4. IT IS NOT A COLLECTION OF DEPARTMENTAL PLANS, COMPILED AND EDITED

   This form of bottom-up planning was a popular pastime in the 1960s and is still practiced at some places. But strategic planning is for the whole institution and for its long-term stature and excellence, not for satisfying dozens of separate internal hopes spun in isolation from a college's overall needs. A university is something more than the aggregate of its parts. A strategic plan is something more than a list of individual wants and aspirations.

5. STRATEGIC DECISION MAKING IS NOT DONE BY PLANNERS

   As one planning official wrote, "First we ask: Who is leading the planning? If it is a planner...we are in trouble."[2] In strategic planning, the planner does not plan. He or she prompts and helps the line officers to plan with statistics, forecasts, institutional data, the best reports by outsiders and on

competitors, and visits to your campus by other strategists, scholars, or consultants. The university planner's duties are two: arranging the process of planning and providing crucial information that helps key officers make decisions that are informed and sensitive to current and emerging realities. It is the president, provost, chairman of the board, financial vice-president, deans, and departments heads who should decide on both the institution's strategy and its implementing tactics. Unless the chief operating officers subscribe-or at least feel they cannot ignore or torpedo the strategy-the plan will not sail.

6. IT IS NOT A SUBSTITUTION OF NUMBERS FOR IMPORTANT INTANGIBLES

Data are used. Computers are employed. Financial forecasts are made. Models may be tried. But these are introduced to sharpen judgments, analyses, and decision, not to substitute for them. They yoke facts to the executives' feel; they bring more enlightened intuition. Quantification is provided mainly to enrich qualitative sagacity not replace it. The essence of academic strategy is decision making. And computers don't make decisions, people do.

7. IT IS NOT A FORM OF SURRENDER TO MARKET CONDITIONS AND TRENDS

Formulating a strategy does not entail giving up all your college stands for in order to get tuition-payers or to go with the flow. It does require you to be aware of the likely markets for higher education, the new forms of delivering information, and the developing conditions that will affect your college and its goals in a profound way. But the Juilliard School does not switch out of music when the arts are in the doldrums, and Illinois's Wheaton College did not drift away from its Christian evangelism moorings during the secular hedonism of the 1965-75 decade. If you intend a wilderness trip, it is wise to have maps and the right equipment and clothing; it does not mean you have to live like primitive people or animals in the wild.

8. STRATEGIC PLANNING IS NOT SOMETHING DONE ON AN ANNUAL RETREAT

It is ongoing, continual, not an activity done separately, away from the classrooms, budgets, laboratories, and libraries. Special sessions are necessary during the formulation stage and when special threats arise. But planning itself is integral not occasional.

9. IT IS NOT A WAY OF ELIMINATING RISKS

If anything, strategic planning increases risk taking. It fosters an entrepreneurial spirit, an readiness to start new ventures. It encourages boldness about opportunities and aggressiveness in the face to threats. In doing so, it often causes disruption. But it recognizes with the prophetic economist Joseph Schumpeter that in our new world of rapid technological advance and shifting international conditions the competition is less and less from small differences in price, size, or quality and more and more "from the new commodity, the new technology, the new source of supply, the new

type of organization--competition ...which strikes not at the margins of profits and outputs of existing firms but at their foundations and their very lives." A clear strategy helps a university take more calculated risks, more risks with a purpose, and proper, necessary risks that enhance the long-term viability and quality of a campus.

10. IT IS NOT AN ATTEMPT TO READ TEA LEAVES AND OUTWIT THE FUTURE

Of course, the future is unpredictable. But it is not a random walk. There are likelihoods, built-in dynamics, national character, and even a few near-certainties. Strategic planning is an effort to make this year's decisions more intelligent by looking toward the probable future and coupling the decision to an overall institutional strategy. It is not a phantasmagoria about tomorrow. It is a set of decisions that need to be begun now if there is to be a secure future--decisions based on the best evidence there is about the unpredictable but not wide-open future.

DESCRIPTION OF SELECTED PLANNING PROCESSES FOR OTHER UNIVERSITIES

The strategically oriented planning processes of the following universities are listed to identify the variety of approaches. Each plan publically identifies specific administrative-academic areas of the university for resource emphasis.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

The most current academic planning process resulted in a 95 page February 1988 document "Commitment to Focus: Academic Priorities 1988-1993." This is the fifth institution-wide academic planning activity since 1975 for the Twin Cities campus, and therefore has had a series of earlier efforts to build upon. It is based on a series of studies to match meeting society's needs and the University's aspirations. The process was initiated by a "Commitment to Focus" essay written by the President, and involved a Faculty Consultative Committee and an Advisory Committee on Planning; the process was administered and staffed by the Office of Provost.

Included are university priorities grouped by general health of the institution (6 priority areas), core programs (5 priority areas), land-grant related programs (9 priority areas), and specific opportunities for building quality (7 priorities). The document lists these specific priorities and identifies resource links to public and private funding; additional planning efforts will follow from the priorities. Specific academic units developed "Strategy for Focus" plans for their areas and these are summarized from the unit perspective and the administrative perspective; a judgement (with rationale) is then provided for taking action. Examples of actions include reducing undergraduate enrollment, restructuring academic units, improvements in infrastructure (e.g., computing, library, instructional equipment), and possible elimination of specific departments.

PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

Beginning in September 1983, the Board of Trustees directed the University President to develop a strategic plan; six purposes for the planning process were identified at the initial announcement. The President then issued a series of

seven principles for guiding strategic planning (developed by two standing committees). These guidelines basically focused on fostering strategic thinking and identifying strategic decisions to set priorities for resource allocation. A year later the President issued a Strategic Planning Guide, consisting of external (opportunities/threats) and internal assessments (strengths/weaknesses), methods and criteria of program evaluation, identification of strategic planning units, and memberships of a series of relevant committees. The most recent university-wide communication is a "Statement of Principles: Stragegies of a Comptehensive University" issued in September 1986; this statement includes goals, recent initiatives and achievements, and specific principles.

Strategic planning is coordinated by the Office of Planning and Analysis, which is responsible for recommending modification in the evolving process. In 1987 a selective academic program review process was initiated, and the capital budget development process was tied more closely to strategic planning. In November of each year, individual college and administrative units submit either a revised comprehensive strategic plan or an update to the existing strategic plan. These submissions include a three-year projection of unit resource requirements, and become the basis for annual planning and budget hearings. One element of the resource projections is the identification of prospective reallocations within the unit.

During the summer months each year, each unit head meets with the provost, budget officer, and planning officer of the University to review planning progress, identify emerging issues, and discuss that year/s resource allocation decisions.

CONTENT OF A TYPICAL STRATEGIC PLANNING PROCESS

While there is a variety of approaches to strategic planning, the final product should address these components.

OVERALL GUIDELINES

1. Establish an on-going, continuous process of strategic planning and management characterized by proactive, strategic thinking and attitudes, and by on-going environmental scanning/data gathering and relevant impact analyses. Begin the process by some informational meetings so all participants understand the approach and concept.

2. Develop a vision statement (to allow some very long term realistic targets - say 20 years) and a mission oriented document (charter-like in content and size) to provide a framework for more detailed analysis and understanding. After the process is completed, the mission (pragmatic) and vision (idealistic) document would be revised.

3. Develop a broad understanding of the external environment, identify (realistically) internal strengths and weaknesses, and designate a few areas (selected in relation to anticipated resource availability and demand) for special emphasis (new or existing areas). After the process is complete, develop a concise mission statement to communicate the essential content of the strategic plan to all appropriate audiences.

4. Compile the strategic choices or recommendations of the individual colleges and departments within the

university (bottom-up planning) and combine into a first draft plan (taking care not to simply staple the individual components together).

SPECIFIC CONTENT GUIDELINES

1. VISION OF THE FUTURE

   A brief statement describing the university in the 21st century. This would allow optimistic but realistic views to be identified and form the basis of focusing on more detail in other components of the plan.

2. MISSION STATEMENT

   A brief statement describing the university today and in the next decade or so. This would provide realistic long term targets, outline the type of university, the constituents, the activities. An additional component might include the SCOPE of the universities (e.g, degrees offered, geographical areas covered).

3. PLANNING ASSUMPTIONS

   A listing of the central assumptions made for the planning period. This avoids the "implicit" assumptions of others by requiring they be stated and debated.

4. EXTERNAL CONDITIONS

   Identification of existing and emerging trends, special areas of opportunity, and areas of threat or concern. This effort might involve cooperation among the universities, the Board, and the Board staff.

5. INTERNAL CONDITIONS

   Identification of strengths, weaknesses, individual planning efforts, trends involving university activities, and existing studies or improvements.

6. STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS

   Selected directions to take based on matching strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats. These would be clearly articulated to all relevant constituencies and change over time.

7. IMPLEMENTATION MEANS

   Stated methods of linking the planning process to budgeting, coordination with other planning activities, and development of action plans to accomplish the strategic directions identified in the process.

8. FEEDBACK PROVISION

   The planning process is iterative, and the various components will change as they are reevaluated. It may take 2-3 years to "smooth" the process and its components.

MISSION STATEMENT GUIDELINES

There is a variety of viewpoints among the participants in the process on the purpose, format, and use of a mission statement. Because of the fundamental importance of a mission statement to the strategic planning process, a few guidelines are developed below to help clarify the term within the context used in this paper.

PURPOSE

- The institutional time frame is greater than any one administrator, and the mission statement identifies the organization. It differentiates the

organization from others that have similar activities.

- The mission statement communicates to internal and external constituencies the essential activities of the organization. A well written mission statement should provide sufficient direction for managers of various administrative levels to make resource allocation decisions which are relatively consistent in rationale throughout the institution.

- It defines the scope of activities (e.g., range, breadth, bounds, limits) of the institution. It defines what the institution will AND will not do.

INGREDIENTS OF SUCCESSFUL MISSION STATEMENTS

- Content is upbeat, inspiring, and optimistic in composition but still sufficiently realistic to be credible.

- Writing is clear and concise, with no mutually inconsistent statements. Terms selected should have common understanding by all readers.

- Includes sufficient specificity to distinguish the organization from similar institutions.

- Includes what the institutional focus is and what major activities it will not engage in (including current and foreseeable future).

- Identifies client groups to be served, how the institution serves each client group, and what values they expect to receive from the institution.

- Clear definition of what the organizational purpose(s) is.

In summary, do not write something unless you mean it. Identify the values of the organization by way of mission statement content. Provide a yardstick against which daily decisions can be made. The overall size might be 1-2 pages at most, and be widely distributed. Do not clutter the mission statement by adding unnecessary content.

DESCRIPTION OF ABOR-UNIVERSITIES PLANNING PROCESS, 1977-1988

1980 MISSION STATEMENT PROCESS

The following listing is from the 1980 mission statement process and is based on submission of answers by the universities to a series of questions developed by the Board of Regents' staff. It involved summarization by the Board staff and several iterations of review and comment by the universities. It involved selected leaders of the business community, other components of higher education in Arizona, and selected legislators. Included was a series of assumptions, limitations, and purpose. It began with "the clear definition of each institution's mission and scope is the very cornerstone of any rational planning process in a university."

The purpose of the mission statement was identified as:

1. Promote access to higher education by insuring that opportunities for all qualified citizens are available;

2. Enhance the diversity of campuses and programs by identifying their unique characteristics and avoiding tendencies for universities to become more and more like one another;

3. Improve quality by establishing missions that discourage the lowering of academic standards in the period of possible competition for students;

4. Insure economy by reducing the potential for unnecessary duplication;

5. Promote credibility by providing each public segment and institution with a realistic and explicit set of expectations about its future program emphases; and

6. Promote public understanding of higher education by illustrating for students, the general public, and the state officials the pattern and logic of the missions and programs of the institutions so that they may have a better basis for making choices.

MISSION STATEMENT REVISIONS

The mission and scope statement was revised (minor) in 1982 and 1983. The current official statement is the 1983 version. It consists of a one page description of each university that includes: type of institution, degree levels offered, enrollment limits, physical plant, continuing education responsibilities, and academic degree programs (selected for emphasis).

In 1983 a fundamentally new process was begun to revise the mission and scope statements. The Academic Affairs Council (Academic Vice Presidents of each university and Academic Affairs Director of ABOR staff), in assisting the Council of Presidents (which had been asked by the Board of Regents), in reviewing the Mission and Scope Statements, identified nine issues for further consideration.

In May 1984 the universities expressed concern about the Board staff's proposed identification of program areas in which the university would develop nationally recognized programs. It was suggested that the identification of specific program areas may be more acceptable in the annual work plan instead of in the Statewide Plan for the University System. Also discussed was program duplication, the need for distinctive missions for each university, the cost of developing nationally recognized programs, and the effect of the identification of specific programs on the morale of faculty in other areas. Initial goals (statewide) were developed by the Board staff and the universities. The procedure was to have the Board staff identify policy issues and discuss them at the February 1985 Board meeting. The actual revised mission and scope statement, and university goals, were submitted in Fall 1985 (in three parts to include Mission and Scope, College Plans, and non-college plans.

Also in 1984, the Academic Affairs Council developed a draft "Arizona University System Statewide Plan 1985-1990". While this draft was never finalized, it formed the basis for revisions in 1986 by the Academic Affairs Council, which also remained in draft. The sections included assumptions, goals, access, response to state needs, diversity (of role, mission, scope), and accountability.

MISSIONS AND PRIORITIES SURVEY

In 1984, a research report titled "Missions and Priorities of Arizona Universities" was developed by Richard Richardson et al. at Arizona State University (at the suggestion originally of the Arizona Academy). A grouping of 10 missions and priorities was developed by

surveying legislators, voters, Regents, Academy members, faculty, and administrators. A 66 item questionnaire was summarized by grouping the responses into 10 mission components.

These are listed in priority order:

1. Teaching Programs and Services
2. Educational and Cultural Services
3. Research and Technical Assistance
4. Health Care for Teaching and Research
5. Improving Quality
6. Student Support Services
7. Broadening Access
8. Optimizing Revenues
9. Emphasizing Minorities and Women
10. Intercollegiate Athletics

Each of these mission components is accompanied by 2-10 specific suggestions.

During FY 86 and FY 87 the Academic Affairs Council developed a series of Issues Facing the Three Universities 1986-2000. These included assumptions for external and internal changes, allocation of resources across instruction, research, and public service (needs/demands/important choices), delivery systems (personnel/facilities/-important choices), and conclusions.

The Academic Affairs Council also identified external driving forces for changes (demographic, social and political, technological, economic, cultural, and education) and internal driving forces (development of knowledge, dissemination of knowledge, resource development and limitations, and management and administration).[17]

FUTURE NEEDS OF THE STATE COMMITTEES

In FY 86 the ABOR established a Future Needs of the State Committee that identified three subcommittees; the subcommittees and a brief description of activities are[18]:

- Education and Public Expectations (Trends and Enrollments: Projections for Arizona's Universities to the Year 2000.

  Identification of five trends (with indicators, public expectations, and emerging issues for each): heightened concern about undergraduate program quality, widespread concerns about faculty, concerns about student access and retention, national concerns about legislative bodies and executive groups establishing university policy. In addition, enrollment projections were made to the year 2000, including assumptions and past trends.

- Government, Budgetary and Natural Resources Considerations

  Summarized three major areas: The Political Environment of the 1990s: The Post-Reagan Era (key features of Arizona's higher education policy system, major change factors in the policy system, opportunities and constraints for higher education); A Closer Look at Financial Resources for Higher Education (the federal role, state revenues and appropriations, tuition and fee revenue, other non-

governmental revenues); and Natural Resources and Environmental Considerations (resources availability, environmental quality, natural resource-based industries, opportunities for the universities).

- Economic, Demographic and Manpower.

  Summary includes: Arizona has become one of the fastest growing states in the nation in terms of population, employment, and income, and this growth seems destined to continue to 2000; population inflows to Arizona are influenced by the business cycle, including more rapid employment contraction than the economy as a whole; the Arizona economy is changing with a decline in agriculture, mining, construction, and government.

In addition, the Future Needs of the State committee developed special papers on Financing Issues Facing the Three Arizona Public Universities 1985-2000 (ABOR Finance Council), The Quality of Academic Programs (Academic Affairs Committee), and Access to the Arizona University System (Committee with representation from each university).

Finally, the Budget Cost Study[19] took a significant amount of time and caused delays in the planning process. In May 1987 an Associate Director (ABOR staff) was hired and the strategic planning process began again.

ENDNOTES

1. There are several Board of Regents' (ABOR) activities underway concurrent with the study by the Task Force. This is especially true with the strategic planning area, possibly causing some of the statements made in this working paper to not reflect the current situation.

2. For a brief description of how the universities are in transition see the Background section of this report Universities in Transition.

3. For a more detailed discussion, see the Working Paper "Future Changes: Implications for Arizona Universities."

4. For more detailed information see the Working Paper "Competitive Advantage of Higher Education in Arizona, Viewed in a National Perspective."

5. See the Task Force Working Paper "Future Changes: Implications for Arizona Universities" for a more detailed discussion.

6. More recently, there has been questioning among the universities and the ABOR staff as to the purpose and content of a "statewide" (ABOR) mission statement in addition to those of the universities; very recently (end of June 1988), this aspect of the process seems to be resolved and is nearly ready for discussion by the Board of Regents.

7. See Mission Statement Guidelines in Part II of this document for examples of mission statement content.

8. These reports were identified by the universities for inclusion in this listing.

9. These joint efforts also involved the ABOR staff.

10. The Strategic Planning Council consists of representatives of each university and the Board staff. Meetings have been held biweekly to develop statewide mission statement and strategic directions. The process is relatively recent (April through June 1988 and continues).

11. The results of these subcommittees are summarized in the Working Paper "Future Changes: Implications for Arizona Universities," June 1988.

12. The strategic planning process and its products are currently undergoing change. What is written here has evolved since February 1988 and further changes should be expected.

13. Several recommendations presented here are currently being acted upon by the ABOR. They are listed because during the Task Force analysis the issues arose.

These ABOR initiated changes during the Task Force study time period are particularly important in the strategic planning area because of the amount of ABOR staff activities.

These recommendations include issues relating to strategic planning, but also include data and analysis oriented recommendations, because of the relevance to the planning process.

14. A more detailed discussion of the changes in Arizona universities is in the Working Paper "Arizona Universities in Transition."

15. The diversity and total programs available in the Arizona universities is found in the "Academic Degree Program Inventory and Planning Document" maintained by the Board of Regents. It is the basic document that lists approved programs or authority to plan new programs. It covers 36 major categories, and involves (about) 300 departments/programs among the three universities. The most recent revision is June 1988.

16. Taken from George Keller, Academic Strategy (see references).

17. For a listing of these driving forces, see the Working Paper "Future Changes: Implications for Arizona Universities."

18. For more details, see Working Paper " Future Changes: Implications for Arizona Universities."

19. The Budget Study was conducted by the ABOR, in cooperation with the Arizona Legislature, during FY 87. It study "examined the degree of congruence between the level of funding for each university and the size and academic mission of that university"; it covered the three year period FY 84-86.